unanalyzed (not in the 1995 EIS) or not a part of the ROD (a part of one of the other alternatives but not a part of Alternative B.) In this case, the additional analysis required is not included in any of the other alternatives in the 1995 EIS. Hence additional analysis is required.

7.0 ALTERNATIVE SELECTION

7.1 Scope of the 1995 EIS

The 1995 EIS identified four alternatives with respect to the INEEL:

- 1) Alternative A No Action
- 2) Alternative B Ten-Year Plan
- 3) Alternative C Minimum Treatment, Storage, and Disposal
- 4) Alternative D Maximum Treatment, Storage, and Disposal.

Under the No Action alternative existing environmental restoration and waste management operations, facilities, and projects would continue to be managed. This included continuing existing environmental restoration, waste management, decontamination and decommissioning, research and development, and infrastructure facilities and projects that support the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program at the INEEL. Naval spent nuclear fuel shipments were only allowed during a three-year transition period. No new major upgrades would be undertaken.

Under Alternative B, existing environmental restoration and waste management facilities and projects would continue to be managed. Besides existing facilities and projects, projects proposed to be built from 1995 – 2005 would be implemented. Environmental restoration, waste management, and spent nuclear fuel projects required to meet regulatory requirements would be performed. Also, increased decontamination and decommissioning activities would take place. Some spent nuclear fuel and waste management projects from other sites would be directed to the INEEL. Specific projects were analyzed through the life cycle of the project and the SNF program was analyzed through 2035.

Under Alternative C, ongoing INEEL spent nuclear fuel, waste management activities, and materials and waste would be transferred to other locations. Environmental restoration activities would be minimized by emphasizing institutional controls over treatment options.

Under Alternative D, to the extent possible, spent nuclear fuel and waste would be transferred from other DOE facilities to the INEEL site for management. Environmental restoration activities would include the maximum planned decontamination and decommissioning projects and would emphasize residential use as the preferred end land use, which potentially would result in maximum waste generation.

7.2 Changes to Alternatives Analyzed

The period of analysis used for INEEL programs (not including SNF) was from 1995 to 2005. The beginning position for the SA was that the validity of the 1995 EIS for possible impacts beyond the year 2005 cannot be verified without additional analysis for those projects that did not perform a longer term analysis.

As the analysis progressed, it became apparent that the analysis was not time frame sensitive for most projects. The following shows how each program analysis is not tied directly to the

time frame for analysis. It should be noted, that specific projects make assumptions regarding availability of services (i.e. onsite disposal of LLW). This analysis is not intended to detract from the validity of these assumptions but to demonstrate overall programmatic actions and their impacts are independent of the timing element.

Decontamination and Decommissioning – These projects are completed on a case-by-case basis. Impacts from each project are not subject to a time dependency. There are no impacts for extending the time frame for the programmatic analysis beyond 2005.

Environmental Restoration – These projects are aimed at remediating and monitoring past environmental impacts. As a result, environmental impacts are going to be positive in the long-term. Hence, the existing analysis is bounding from a time perspective.

High-Level Waste – This program is currently considering changes to the programmatic activities through the HLW & FD EIS. The time frame for this analysis is through 2095.

Infrastructure – The impacts from existing Infrastructure are fairly constant over time. Any major changes in the program will require additional analysis. Current proposed actions are consistent with those already analyzed.

Spent Nuclear Fuel - The Spent Nuclear Fuel program has been analyzed through 2035.

Waste Management – The current foreseeable future for the waste management program does not include any major changes from current analyzed projects. Any changes would require additional analysis.

While the 1995 EIS used a cutoff date of 2005 for the analysis, this review has determined that the 1995 EIS provides a bounding analysis for most projects beyond 2005. This issue should be reexamined when the next Supplement Analysis is conducted to ensure the continued validity of this determination. Any changes in programmatic actions will require additional analysis to determine whether the proposed changes are within or outside of the scope of the 1995 EIS.

8.0 ENVIRONMENTAL DISCIPLINE CHANGE ANALYSIS

8.1 Introduction to the Environmental Discipline Change Analysis

A major focus of the Supplement Analysis is the change analysis for the different environmental disciplines addressed by the 1995 EIS. The change analysis is a disciplined approach to determining what has changed over the last five years in each of the disciplines. These changes were then evaluated to determine whether the environmental discipline changes have resulted in environmental impacts different than previously reported or whether those changes are expected to produce impacts different than previously reported.

As opposed to the program change analysis where individual projects were found not to be covered by the 1995 EIS, the 1995 EIS covered each environmental discipline by evaluating potential environmental impacts of activities on the INEEL. The exception is the new field of long-term stewardship which is included in this analysis. This change analysis was done to determine whether the specific disciplines had experienced changes in models, assumptions, or data that would warrant additional analysis.